

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action of December 16, 2005, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

#### ***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1, 3, 13, 21, 23, 33, 38, 11, 12, 20, 31, 32, 36, 37, 41, 42, and 43-47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi (U.S. Pat. No. 6,633,759) in view of Jokimies (U.S. Pat. No. 5,353,328).

Independent claims 1, 13, 21, 33 and 38 all relate to, *inter alia*, transmitting data, for synchronization with a second device, from a first device to the second device via an intermediate device. Contrary to the Office Action's assertions, Kobayashi does not teach or suggest such a feature. The passage relied upon by the Office Action states "data can be transmitted/received among more than two devices to display data on desired software installed in another device on its own display screen." Col. 14, ll. 26-32. Nowhere in this or any passage does Kobayashi teach or suggest an intermediate device through which a first device transmits data to a second device. The Office Action alleges that Kobayashi discloses a cellular phone constituting an intermediate terminal device and that the "another device" of Kobayashi is equivalent to the second device. Applicants disagree. The cited passage merely discloses that the PC may make connections with multiple devices (one with each of the multiple devices) so that data may be displayed on the desired software of each of the multiple devices. Even assuming, *arguendo*, the cellular phone does transmit data to a third terminal, nowhere does Kobayashi teach or suggest that the cellular phone transmits the data to be synchronized received from the PC to the third terminal. Jokimies also does not teach or suggest an intermediate terminal device and thus, fails to cure this deficiency of Kobayashi. As such claims 1, 13, 21, 33 and 38 are allowable for at least this reason.

Additionally and as argued in the Applicants' previous response, there is no motivation to combine Kobayashi with Jokimies. Kobayashi describes a short range connection between a mobile telephone and a PC that requires establishing a dedicated and continuous wireless link between the mobile telephone and the PC. Col. 2, ll. 31-40. Jokimies, on the other hand,

discloses a SMS messaging adapter. Abstract. SMS messaging is a store and forward service, wherein the short messages are not sent directly from the sender to the recipient via a continuous data connection. Applicant's Specification, ¶¶ [0007] & [0023]. Even assuming that Jokimies taught that which the examiner proffers, which Applicant maintains it does not, the suggested combination of Jokimies with Kobayashi would render Kobayashi unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. For example, Kobayashi relies upon the continuous direct wireless link to allow manipulation of software on one device by another and for the transmission of data (e.g., screen data as the result of a job) in *real time*. Col. 8, ll. 64-67; Col. 12, ll. 27-32; Col. 13, ll. 14-17. As such, using a SMS service, whereby the messages are stored and forwarded with no establishment of a dedicated wireless link, would interfere with the real time manipulation and transmission methods of Kobayashi. In other words, SMS service would not guarantee real time service, which, as evidenced above, is a critical component of Kobayashi. Significantly, the Federal Circuit has clearly held that if a proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. *In re Gordon*, 221 U.S.P.Q. 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Thus, there is no motivation or suggestion to make the proposed modification.

In addition, whereas Kobayashi is dedicated to a short-range wireless communication link, Jokimies is related to a cellular network, which is long-range. Kobayashi even stresses the short-range wireless communication requirement by disclosing, at Col. 14, ll. 26-32, that data can be transmitted/received among more than two devices "if the device is provided with a similar wireless communication function (*a wireless LAN or Bluetooth System in 2.45 Ghz*)."  
(emphasis added). Bluetooth and wireless LAN's are both known to be short-range wireless communication protocols. Thus, one of skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of Jokimies and Kobayashi in the manner suggested by the Office Action. As such, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness at least these additional reasons.

Claims 3, 11, 12, 20, 23, 31, 32, 36, 37, 41, 42, and 43-47 are dependent on their respective base independent claims and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons as those claims and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Claims 4, 5, 24, 25, 35, and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi in view of Jokimies and further in view of Lohtia (U.S. Pat. No. 6,560,456). These claims are allowable based on the allowability of their respective base claims, because Lohtia does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Kobayashi and Jokimies, and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited in each of the claims.

Claims 6, 15, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi in view of Jokimies and further in view of Alanara (U.S. Pat. No. 6,097,961). These claims are allowable based on the allowability of their respective base claims, because Alanara does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Kobayashi and Jokimies, and further in view of the additional features recited in each claim.

Claims 10, 19, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kobayashi in view of Jokimies. These claims are allowable based on the allowability of their respective base claims, and further in view of the additional novel and non-obvious features recited in each claim.

Applicant reserves the right to further attack the motivation to combine any or all of the cited references, but believes this is not necessary at this time based on the above-noted features lacking from each reference.

Appln. No.: 09/941,851  
Amendment dated March 16, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of December 16, 2005

**CONCLUSION**

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3156.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 16 day of March, 2006 By:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chunhsia Andy Mu, Registration No. 58,216  
1001 G Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001